



to the scope or not.

This objection also applies to Claims 2, 6 and 7.

1.5 In Claim 3 (page 10/1, line 11) the expression "same kind" is vague.

This objection also applies to Claim 8 (line 16).

2. Claim 1 is not allowable due to lack of inventive step, Articles 52(1) and 56.

2.1 **D1 = US-A-5379292**, corresponding to **JP-A-5014353**, discloses a gateway device for interconnecting two buses in which information to be communicated is made of a header field containing information necessary for communication and a message field containing information to be used at the receiving side (col. 3, lines 13-37 and 41-43, figs. 1 and 2). The device comprises judging means for judging, based on the information to be communicated, whether or not the information received from one bus should be transmitted to the other bus and filtering means for transmitting the received information to the other bus when the received information is judged to be the information that should be transmitted to the other bus (col. 4, lines 21-28).

2.2 In addition Claim 1 mentions that judgment is based on the contents of the message field.

This is, however, a common design measure for filtering information based on its content. When judging as to whether information has to be transmitted to the other bus different criteria are possible, like whether the recipient is on the other bus or whether specific content should be allowed. If the content to be conveyed is chosen as criterion, than it is obvious to a skilled person that judgment as to whether information should be transmitted has to be based on the message field, which conveys the information content, rather than the header field which indicates the recipient of the information.

3. The features of Claim 1 mentioned under point 2.1 are also known from **D2 = DE-A-4110372**, corresponding to **JP-A-3283842**, see D2 col. 4, lines 22-31, col. 7,